United Nations A/C.1/60/PV.20

General Assembly
Sixtieth session

Official Records

First Committee
20th meeting
Wednesday, 26 October 2005, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: Choi Young-jin ..... (Republic of Korea)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda items 85 to 105 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: Today, the Committee will take action on draft resolutions that appear in revised informal working paper 3, which contains 14 draft resolutions in six clusters. Cluster 1 contains three draft resolutions; cluster 2, one; cluster 4, three; cluster 5, one; cluster 6; three; and cluster 7, three.

We begin with cluster 1.

I now call on delegations wishing to speak in explanation of position or vote before the voting.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I should like to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

The Russian Federation will vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Japan. We note the positive and constructive work undertaken by the delegation of Japan in preparing the draft. Russia has provided detailed information to the First Committee concerning the principles underpinning our position on the draft resolution on nuclear weapons. It is important to us that we not underestimate the progress that has been made in that sphere with respect to the obligations of Member States and their fulfilment. We are prepared to adopt a realistic and balanced approach to the issue.

Mr. Prasad (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", as contained in document A/C.1/60/L.4.

India remains committed to the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. India also shares the view that nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing. We continue to believe that the best and most effective non-proliferation measure would be a credible, time-bound programme for global, non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament.

Given that the draft resolution seeks a nuclear-weapon-free world, we would have preferred references in it to no first use and non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States, as well as to the reduction of nuclear dangers through de-alerting and other measures, as such steps would be important interim measures which would facilitate the move towards a world free of nuclear weapons.

We find instead that those and certain other specific proposals contained in the resolution adopted last year are not reflected in the draft resolution now placed before us. Furthermore, India cannot accept the call to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a non-nuclear-weapon

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

05-57125 (E)

State. In urging India to do so promptly and without conditions, the draft resolution moves away from the practice of not referring by name to States not party to a treaty. It thus negates customary international law, as enshrined in the Vienna Law of Treaties, which lays down that no legal obligation can be imposed on a country without its sovereign consent. It is also in marked deviation from the resolution adopted last year, which removed many of the prescriptive suggestions that were not central to the main objective of the resolution.

Our objections to the final document of the 2000 Review Conference of the States Parties to the NPT are well known. We shall therefore be constrained to vote against the draft resolution.

Ms. Mtshali (South Africa): I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the partners of the New Agenda Coalition — Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Sweden and my own country, South Africa — to explain the New Agenda's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28**, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", that was submitted by Japan this year.

The New Agenda Coalition believes that the First Committee must send a strong message in pursuit of the objective of a nuclear-weapon-free world. That is particularly relevant in view of the failure of the 2005 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) to achieve any substantive outcome, as well as the inability of the recently concluded General Assembly High-level Plenary Meeting to reach agreement on matters relating to nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. The sixtieth anniversary of the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki further underscores the need for renewed determination to realize the vision of a nuclear-weapon-free world.

A need exists for greater coherence and determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons. In that context, and without prejudging our future position, the States members of the New Agenda Coalition will vote in favour of the Japanese draft resolution, notwithstanding our preference that it contain stronger references to practical steps for nuclear disarmament and the unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals, as agreed upon at the 2000 NPT Review Conference.

Mr. Abdelaziz (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): In addition to the explanation of vote made by the representative of South Africa on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28, our delegation would like to add some elements that contributed to our changing our voting intention on the draft resolution this year.

At the outset, I extend my thanks to the delegation of Japan for its positive work on the draft resolution and for taking into consideration the many issues whose amendment we urged.

Despite the fact that the draft resolution does not fulfil all our wishes, and given the fact that its adoption coincides with the sixtieth anniversary of the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and our keen interest in the total elimination of nuclear weapons on this occasion, as well as in solidarity with Japan, and in emphasis of Egypt's political priorities on this core issue, we have decided to abandon our abstentions of past years to a vote in favour of the draft resolution this year.

In that connection, Egypt does not objectively oppose the strengthening of the safeguards regime or the contents of the Additional Protocol. However, we have reservations concerning the international community's focus on generalizing the issue because our position is governed by two main factors.

First, we stress the fact that accession to the Additional Protocol is optional. Secondly, Egypt is not prepared to enter into additional commitments at a time when a single State in the Middle East insists on remaining outside the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and continues to refuse to place its nuclear programme under the comprehensive safeguards regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Mr. Mine (Japan): I would like to make a few remarks on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.4, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", which Japan will support in the voting.

Before doing so, however, I must recall the regrettable outcome of the 2005 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), as well as the 2005 world summit outcome, which found no agreement on the substantive issues related to disarmament and non-

proliferation. We must try our best to ensure that such a lack of consensus does not erode the existing disarmament and non-proliferation regimes, and for that purpose it is essential that all Member States solidify their efforts to promote disarmament and non-proliferation.

Last year, Japan took the decision to support the New Agenda Coalition resolution and continues to do so this year, even though Japan does not necessarily agree with all of the points contained in the draft resolution. In that regard, Japan is very pleased at and highly appreciates the fact that all New Agenda Coalition member countries will vote in favour of Japan's draft resolution on nuclear disarmament. Japan hopes that such mutual efforts and cooperation will help to create a strong momentum to further strengthen disarmament and non-proliferation.

Mr. Carriedo (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to explain Spain's vote on the draft resolution on the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty, contained in document A/C.1/60/L.8.

Spain has always taken the view that nuclear-weapon-free zones created on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at by consensus among the States of a region make an important contribution to strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime and efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament. More specifically, Spain has unequivocally stated its support for the goals set forth in the Pelindaba Treaty as a way of maintaining the absence and preventing the installation of nuclear weapons in a neighbouring continent and of reflecting our desire to see the Treaty enter into force as soon as possible.

As reflected by the guidelines adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its 1999 substantive session on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned, every zone is the product of specific circumstances and must reflect the diversity of situations existing within it. Every nuclear-weapon-free zone must be a well-defined geographic entity.

In that regard, after very carefully considering the invitation extended to Spain to join Protocol III to the Pelindaba Treaty, my Government, in consultation with our Parliament, decided that it was not appropriate to accede to that Protocol and so informed the depositary of the Treaty, for two principal reasons.

First, the Pelindaba Treaty contains no provision, obligation, guarantee or safeguard in the field of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation that Spain has not already adopted throughout its national territory, clearly including those parts that fall within the geographical zone to which the Treaty applies. Indeed, through its ratification of other international treaties and implementation of various unilateral measures, Spain is legally and irreversibly committed not to produce nuclear weapons, to denuclearize its entire territory militarily, and to use nuclear energy exclusively for peaceful purposes. Moreover, as a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM), the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Spain has already undertaken and abides by a series of obligations and safeguards that go well beyond those provided for in the Pelindaba Treaty.

Secondly, the signing and subsequent ratification of Protocol III would create a redundant nuclear control regime over those parts of Spanish territory that, in accordance with the Treaty, fall within its geographical purview but are already subject to the comprehensive nuclear monitoring carried out by the aforementioned agencies — IAEA, EURATOM, OSCE and NATO — throughout Spanish territory.

Allow me to elaborate our rationale further. I stress that Spain is a country that abides by a wide range of commitments in the fields of nuclear weapons control and nuclear non-proliferation. In addition to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Spain has also ratified the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, the Convention on Nuclear Safety and the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management. By the same token, on 14 September, Spain signed the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism. All of Spain's nuclear facilities are devoted exclusively to the peaceful use of nuclear energy and subject to the dual monitoring of the IAEA and EURATOM in the framework of the generalized safeguards agreement between the non-nuclear-weapon States members of the European Union and the IAEA. Moreover, Spain, together with the said States, has ratified the Additional Protocol of the generalized

safeguards agreement, which provides for verification standards well beyond those embodied in the Pelindaba Treaty. Spain is also pleased to contribute to the IAEA-African Regional Cooperation Agreement programme, financing projects for the peaceful applications of nuclear energy in Africa.

Furthermore, those parts of Spain's territory falling within the geographical area to which the Treaty applies are, in their entirety, an integral part of the European Union and therefore of the process of political and economic integration that the Union embodies. With respect to the specific field of security, they are an integral part of the Washington Treaty, the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, and the 1994 Vienna Document on confidence-building measures. The aforementioned parts of Spain's territory therefore fall within the boundaries of the European Union, NATO and OSCE and consequently should not have been included *ab initio* in the area covered by the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty.

Finally, I would recall that all of Spain's territory, including those parts that fall within the geographical area to which the Pelindaba Treaty applies, was denuclearized militarily pursuant to the Treaty of Friendship, Defence and Cooperation signed with the United States in 1976. That denuclearization has been reaffirmed in successive revisions of that Treaty in 1982, 1988 and 2002. By the same token, a ban on the introduction, installation or storage of nuclear weapons throughout Spanish territory was included in the parliamentary authorization to the Spanish Government to accede to the NATO Treaty in October 1981. That 1981 decision of the Spanish Parliament to denuclearize all Spanish territory militarily was reiterated in 1985 prior to the March 1986 consultative referendum that decided on Spain's accession to NATO. Spain therefore enjoys with NATO the status of a militarily denuclearized country throughout its national territory. Spain has thus renounced the production of nuclear weapons, militarily denuclearized its entire national territory, is committed to the exclusively peaceful use of nuclear energy, and has contracted to and abides by obligations that go well beyond those provided for in the Pelindaba Treaty.

Moreover, the application of the Treaty to those parts of Spanish territory that fall within the geographical area to which the Treaty applies would create a redundant and unnecessary nuclear control regime, since they are already subject to the comprehensive monitoring throughout Spanish territory of the four international organizations I cited earlier: IAEA, EURATOM, OSCE and NATO.

I reiterate that my country has always considered nuclear-weapon-free zones to be an important contribution to strengthening international peace and security and that it fully shares the goals set forth in the Pelindaba Treaty. Spain has therefore always joined in the consensus on the First Committee's resolution on the Treaty since it was first introduced in 1997.

However, the Spanish delegation, as it stated after the consensus adoptions of the resolution in 1997, 1999, 2001 and 2003, does not consider itself to be bound by that consensus with respect to operative paragraph 3, regarding which we retain serious reservations because the Spanish authorities have concluded decisively and irreversibly that Spain cannot sign or ratify Protocol III to the Pelindaba Treaty for the reasons that I have enumerated.

We have tried since 1997 to persuade the sponsors of the resolution, which remain unchanged this year, of the need to find a more balanced wording of operative paragraphs 2 and 3. The current wording is clearly discriminatory in singling Spain out among the six countries concerned by the Protocols to the Pelindaba Treaty, while the remaining five countries are referred to by the broader formula embodied in operative paragraph 2. Indeed, the difference between my country and the nuclear-weapon States is that the latter are not singled out individually with respect to any obligation under the Pelindaba Treaty, but are assigned a collective responsibility under operative paragraph 2.

All the good faith and transparent efforts made by Spain to achieve more balance in the wording of operative paragraphs 2 and 3 have been in vain. Both paragraphs have remained unchanged every two years. That situation is unsatisfactory to the Spanish delegation.

Let me reiterate once again that Spain does not seek to modify the Pelindaba Treaty or its Protocols; it seeks only to modify operative paragraph 3 of the biannual resolution of the General Assembly in order to make it acceptable to all interested parties. As everyone knows, the last time the First Committee considered the resolution in 2003, my delegation presented a written amendment to operative

paragraph 3, which we later withdrew in order to preserve consensus on an issue of such importance to my country, confident as we were that our legitimate concerns would be met. Furthermore, my delegation noted that unless an acceptable solution were found before the First Committee's consideration of the draft resolution in 2005, Spain would not join the consensus.

Nevertheless, in order not to add new and disturbing elements to the somewhat egregious situation of disarmament and non-proliferation issues in multilateral forums, the Spanish delegation decided not to challenge the consensus on the draft resolution before us. We trust that, over the next two years, we can reach satisfactory wording for operative paragraph 3. I take this opportunity to announce that the Spanish delegation shortly intends to initiate consultations to that end with other interested delegations. I am confident that, in the context of those consultations and in a spirit of dialogue and pragmatism, we will be able to achieve a result satisfactory to all.

Mr. Hamid (Islamic Republic of Iran): My statement is in regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.28, "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution this year, in contrast with our abstention on the resolution last year. That change is due mainly to the positive changes made to the draft resolution. However, we think that the draft resolution could be further strengthened in aspects relevant to nuclear disarmament measures and obligations. We believe that the draft resolution should have been further strengthened with respect to the reaffirmation of the importance of the practical steps agreed within the Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

While the draft resolution touches on some concepts, such as the universalization of the Additional Protocol, that are still far from enjoying general agreement among the States parties to the NPT — and we express our reservations with regard to that concept — it lacks sufficient emphasis on some other aspects of nuclear disarmament that have received great support from the international community, mainly on the important role of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

However, my delegation can associate itself with the spirit, approach and many elements included in the text, and will therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. Matambo (Zimbabwe): My delegation wants to indicate that Zimbabwe is withdrawing its name from the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.4.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, but before we do, let me announce that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8 — "African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty" — have requested a deferral of action on the draft resolution. There will therefore be no deliberation today of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.4.

A recorded vote has been requested. A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 4.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.4 is entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the Committee's 8th meeting on 10 October.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.4 and A/C.1/60/INF.2. In addition, Jordan and Kenya have become co-sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Committee will now proceed to take a separate vote on operative paragraph 4, which reads as follows:

> "Further calls upon all States parties to spare no efforts to achieve the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and urges India, Israel and Pakistan, which are not yet parties to the Treaty, to accede to it as non-nuclear weapon States promptly and without conditions".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia,

Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia

Against:

India, Israel, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Australia, Bhutan, Cameroon, France, Jamaica, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Operative paragraph 4 was retained by 148 votes to 3, with 9 abstentions.

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.4 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, India, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Australia, Belarus, Bhutan, Estonia, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Micronesia (Federated States of), Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.4 was adopted by 144 votes to 5, with 19 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28. A recorded vote has been requested.

The Secretary: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Japan at the 20th meeting on 26 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.28 and A/C.1/60/INF/2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, Niger, Uzbekistan and Germany.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bhutan, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Israel, Myanmar, Pakistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28 was adopted by 166 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position after the vote.

Mr. Rivasseau (France): I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the United Kingdom, the United States of America and France, to explain our negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.4, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". This draft resolution has been submitted over a number of years, and contains important elements that we support.

However, when the draft resolution was submitted last year, we were sorry to find that the text

still contained many elements that did not command consensus and were not acceptable to the United Kingdom, the United States of America and France. We note that this year this text takes a more pragmatic approach. Nevertheless, certain elements are not acceptable to us. The title does not reflect the progress being made towards nuclear disarmament. The content of the draft resolution does not take due account of a full range of obligations on the part of all of us towards nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament, or the most pressing contemporary challenges to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and global security.

As we stated in our explanation of vote on this draft resolution last year, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and France remain fully committed to meeting our obligations, as strictly provided for under article 6 of the NPT. We have taken significant measures on nuclear disarmament ourselves, and support nuclear weapons reduction worldwide. Unfortunately, this draft resolution does not take sufficient account of the progress that has been made in this regard. All previous resolutions mentioned the Moscow Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions. This is not the case this year, despite the fact that the Treaty in question commits the United States and Russia to reduce their nuclear arsenals by several thousand warheads over the next decade.

We are committed to exploring ways to achieve progress and strengthen the global disarmament and non-proliferation regime. We continue to believe that the international community must take responsibility and address the serious threat posed to peace and security by proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. We hope that ongoing dialogue among States parties will help lead to a future strengthening of the NPT.

Ms. García (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela attaches priority attention to and totally supports the elimination of nuclear weapons. That is why we have voted in favour of the draft resolution embodied in A/C.1/60/L.28, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

However, we would like to place on record that we have not been satisfied with the draft resolution as it stands, because we feel that the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki inflicted heavy losses on the Japanese population, and the death-dealing effects thereof continue to be reflected in the pain and devastation caused to the victims and their family members. We should have liked this draft resolution to highlight the problems endured by the victims of the nuclear bombing in the operative section calling on States to comply with their international responsibility to ensure that proper treatment be given to the victims and their family members still suffering from the consequences of the attacks. In this connection we should like to recall that States are duty-bound to guarantee respect for human rights and for international humanitarian law for the purpose of preserving the dignity and the value of the human person.

Mr. Roa (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to offer an explanation of vote after the vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.4 and A/C.1/60/L.28. Colombia wishes to state that we have just voted in favour of both drafts; however we would like to explain that, with regard to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), Colombia reiterates what it has said previously before this Committee with regard to draft resolutions presented in the past on both these agenda items.

In line with international law and our country's constitution, we can only be called upon to implement these Treaties from the time our country ratifies them. Over the last several years, we have addressed the issue with the Provisional Technical Secretariat for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) and before the Preparatory Commission dealing with subsidiary organs. We fully confirm our commitment to this Treaty and will continue to seek ways and means of overcoming the constitutional impediments to the Treaty's ratification. We appreciate the interest shown by a number of States in helping us overcome these constitutional impediments that have stood in the way of our ratifying the Treaty. We would like, indeed, to ratify it at the earliest possible date.

Our proposals for overcoming this problem continue to be discussed and studied in the context of the Preparatory Commission for the CTBTO and its subsidiary bodies, with the advice and counsel of the Provisional Technical Secretariat. We hope and expect that these discussions will soon lead to speedy resolution of the problem that Colombia has addressed in connection with ratification.

Mr. Prasad (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", as contained in document A/C.1/60/L.28.

India fully supports the basic intent of the draft resolution, the total elimination of nuclear weapons. We agree that the ultimate objective of States is general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control, as contained in the final document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We very much appreciate Japan's commitment to this goal. However, we find that the draft resolution incorporates elements that are not acceptable to us. We cannot, for instance, accept a call to join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as a non-nuclear-weapon State. Thus, while we agree with the basic objective of the draft resolution, that is, the global elimination of nuclear weapons, we are constrained to vote against the draft resolution.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We would like to speak in explanation of vote A/C.1/60/L.4, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". We wish to acknowledge the efforts of States of the New Agenda Coalition for their preparation this year of the text of the draft resolution on the question of nuclear disarmament that would be more acceptable to all States. The text was substantively reworked and shortened. We take note of its specifically positive dynamic. The draft resolution contains fundamentally important provisions that Russia shares. In particular, these refer to the importance of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the commitment to non-proliferation.

Nevertheless, we abstained in the vote. The first reason for that is the title of the draft resolution. The issue is raised here of an artificial acceleration of nuclear disarmament which does not take into account political, technical and financial restrictions. The Russian Federation is committed to its obligations under article 6 of the NPT. Moreover, we believe that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is possible only through a gradual, staged progress towards the ultimate goal, on the basis of a comprehensive approach, without artificially racing ahead, with the participation of all nuclear States and, naturally, in circumstances where strategic stability and compliance with the principle of equal security for all are retained.

The second reason for our abstention is found in the sixth preambular paragraph, which contains the words "lack of implementation of binding obligations and agreed steps toward nuclear disarmament". It is hard for us to agree with such an assessment of Russia's real, major and irreversible practical steps towards reducing nuclear weapons in accordance with existing commitments.

Mr. Atieh (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation has asked for the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28. Based on Syria's support for international efforts to implement nuclear disarmament, we supported the draft resolution, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". However, we would like to express our reservations regarding what is stated here on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and, in particular, the tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 8, because of the position we have voiced on several occasions concerning this Treaty. We believe that these provisions in fact are keeping the draft resolution from reaching its ultimate objective of nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): I would like to present the explanation of vote of my delegation on the two draft resolutions adopted by the Committee. First, I will explain our position on the draft resolution entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", as contained in document A/C.1/60/L.4.

Last year, my delegation appreciated the efforts of the sponsors in revising the contents of the draft resolution to move its focus onto the importance of the objectives of nuclear disarmament. These are objectives that Pakistan has already supported. The removal of references on which we had reservations also enabled the Pakistan delegation last year to vote in favour of the resolution. However, the decision by the sponsors this year to name the countries outside the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the call for accession without conditions, including the references to the NPT final documents, have obliged my delegation to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole and have also obliged us to vote

against operative paragraph 4, which is in line with our clear position on the universalization of the NPT.

I would now like to present before the Committee our explanation of vote on the draft resolution entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", as contained in document A/C.1/60/L.28.

My delegation does not agree with several provisions of the draft resolution. It places inordinate emphasis on non-proliferation rather than on nuclear disarmament which, in our view, should be its central focus. This inordinate emphasis is indeed a reflection of a regression in this vital area. In accordance with our consistent position on the NPT, we cannot accept the call to accede to it as a non-nuclear-weapon State. Nor do we consider ourselves bound by any of the provisions that emanate from the NPT Review Conferences or other forums in which Pakistan is not represented.

While my delegation supports the objective of total elimination of nuclear weapons, it cannot agree to some of the suggested proposals that are both selective and unrealistic. Therefore, my delegation decided to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution rather than voting against it.

Mr. Carriedo (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): First let me clarify that when Spain delivered its explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8, on the Treaty of Pelindaba, it believed that action would be taken on that draft resolution today. That not being the case, it is my assumption that there will be no need for us to repeat it when action is taken.

Now I should like to take the floor to offer an explanation of Spain's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.4, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". Spain is a State firmly committed to peace and to following through on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation commitments. Spain's view is that both concepts and objectives, disarmament and non-proliferation, are indivisibly intertwined, inasmuch as they mutually reinforce each other as we seek to attain a single, more extensive goal — international peace and security. In this sense, Spain has always pursued an absolutely responsible and balanced policy that has been consistent with its international and regional commitments in the security arena.

Further proof of that commitment to peace and nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation is my country's decision once again to join the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", which Spain has always supported in past sessions, because it considers that draft resolution to be balanced and conducive to achieving a global consensus.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.4, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", Spain wishes to pay tribute to the constructive efforts by the New Agenda Coalition, which led the draft resolution. The text is a step in the right direction, that is, towards the achievement of a more balanced and pragmatic text conducive to the achievement of a global consensus. However, Spain believes that the draft resolution still has room for improvement and that, in the context of its international and regional commitments in the area of security, it would not be opportune for Spain to reconsider its abstention on that draft resolution at this time.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): My delegation is taking the floor to explain France's vote on resolution A/C.1/60/L.28, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

France has decided to support that draft resolution. By its vote, my country wished to express its support for the growing number of States that approach the question of nuclear disarmament with seriousness and in good faith, and which have supported the text proposed by Japan.

The structure and substance of the text of that draft resolution has been updated compared to last year's text. It is demanding. It raises certain fundamental problems. Of those, I shall mention two that are of particular importance for my country: irreversibility and transparency. France recalls that in the Council Common Position of 25 April 2005 relating to the 2005 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the European Union recognized the:

> "application of the principle of irreversibility to guide all measures in the field of nuclear disarmament and arms control, as a contribution

to the maintenance and reinforcement of international peace, security and stability, taking these conditions into account".

That Common Position of the European Union also promoted "pursuing efforts to secure transparency, as a voluntary confidence-building measure to support further progress in disarmament".

Our vote today in favour of the draft resolution does not imply that we renounce that Common Position, which remains the reference point for France's engagements in those two areas. We hope that in the future our position will be better taken into account.

France also recalls that the nuclear deterrence remains an essential foundation of its security and that the question of nuclear disarmament, in conformity with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, is part of the framework for general and complete disarmament. That issue cannot be separated from the analysis of the conditions of international security and stability.

The Chairman: The Committee will move on to cluster 2, "Other Weapons of Mass Destruction".

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.51.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.51 is entitled "Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 10th meeting, on 12 October.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.51 and A/C.1/60/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have now become sponsors of the draft resolution: Albania, Azerbaijan, Denmark, Estonia, Ireland, Italy, Kyrgyzstan and Serbia and Montenegro.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.51, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chairman: I now open the floor to delegations wishing to take the floor in explanation of vote after the vote.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): My delegation supports the objectives of the draft resolution just adopted, contained in document A/C.1/60/L.51, although we continue to believe that the language of the draft resolution could have been improved to convey a more objective reflection of reality.

As the Committee would note, even in the case of the terrorist group Aum Shinrikyo in March 1995, the subsequent investigation established that, despite the considerable financial and technical resources and know-how of that organization, it met with logistic failure in its other plans — for the production of weapons of mass destruction.

We agree with the widely held view that the best guarantee against the threat of the possible use of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons lies in their total elimination.

There are other relevant issues in this whole debate, among which are serious concerns at the alarmingly slow pace of the destruction of weaponized chemical agents by the major possessor States. We continue to believe that, as long as those weapons continue to exist in such huge quantities, the possibility of their falling into terrorist hands also remains.

With respect to the Biological Weapons Convention, a compliance mechanism is still not in sight. We believe that a compliance mechanism that put implementation of the Biological Weapons Convention on the same footing as implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention would have promoted international peace and security and addressed the concerns expressed, for example, in the draft resolution just adopted.

Finally, the draft resolution quite appropriately mentions the Final Document of the Thirteenth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries as having expressed itself on the issue of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism. My delegation would like to remind the Committee that, in the context of the issue of terrorism, the document also stresses the need to address the causes which sometimes lead to terrorism — causes that lie in suppression, injustice and deprivation.

The Chairman: The Committee will move to cluster 4, "Conventional weapons".

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union on draft decision A/C.1/60/L.55, entitled "International instrument to enable States to identify and trace, in a timely and reliable manner, illicit small arms and light weapons".

The European Union welcomes the hard work done by the Open-ended Working Group on marking and tracing under the chairmanship of Ambassador Thalmann. While supporting the decision to adopt the instrument, we must register our regret that no operational provisions on ammunition and peacekeeping operations were included, and that the instrument is not legally binding. It is, however, an important step in the implementation of the 2001 Programme of Action. In that sense, it represents a positive signal from the international community to those countries most affected by the scourge. If it is applied by States with the necessary political will, the content of the instrument will help to discourage, and thus reduce, illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons. We hope that it can be strengthened at further review meetings.

The European Union is strongly committed to promoting further discussion of the issue of ammunition, thus taking up the recommendations of the Chairman's procedural report. The European Union appeals to all Member States to support the adoption of the draft decision by consensus. The European Union would regret any break in consensus.

Miss Majali (Jordan): My delegation would like to add its name to the list of sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/60/L.55, entitled "International instrument to enable States to identify and trace, in a timely and reliable manner, illicit small arms and light weapons".

My delegation would like to do so because it believes that although the instrument is not legally binding, it is nevertheless a step in the right direction — a step that has been arrived at through positive and constructive work under the chairmanship of Ambassador Anton Thalmann, and that upheld a principle of our work — that of consensus.

In the light of that fact, my delegation decided to co-sponsor the draft decision.

Mrs. Ferrari (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM).

CARICOM States wish to place on record their deep disappointment with regard to the outcome of the negotiations of the Open-ended Working Group and the recommendation placed before the Committee. CARICOM supports the Programme of Action adopted by the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, but takes the view that that document is but the first step in the process of controlling the proliferation of small arms and light weapons. The Programme of Action is a political document that addresses only part of the problem. Compliance is voluntary, since it does not impose legal obligations on States. CARICOM States are strongly committed to the implementation of the Programme of Action, but believe that there is a need for further action to address gaps in existing policy implementation at all levels.

The failure of the Open-ended Working Group to reach consensus on a strong and substantial instrument is a cause for regret. Such failure was provoked by the obstructive tactics of a very few delegations, for reasons which are still unclear to the CARICOM States, since all States, large and small, would benefit from greater control over small arms and light weapons.

The uncontrolled spread and use of small arms and light weapons poses a dangerous threat to the national security, law-enforcement efforts and economic and social development of many of our small countries as, in spite of our best efforts, we continue to face the spread of illicit weapons throughout our territories, most often through the illegal diversion of such weapons.

The nexus between small arms and light weapons and other forms of criminal activity is therefore one of the most serious threats to security in our region. International action to enable States to identify and trace illicit small arms and light weapons remains a priority for CARICOM States. An inadequate instrument should not be the end of the process, but merely a starting point.

CARICOM believes that an effective, multilateral, legally binding international instrument on identifying and tracing illicit small arms, light weapons and ammunition would have made an important

contribution to existing national, bilateral and regional efforts to control the proliferation of small arms and light weapons, which so heavily taxes the human and financial resources of the region. Such an instrument should have been based on firm obligations so as to enable States to trace existing lines of supply of illegal weapons, prevent the creation of new lines of supply and prevent the diversion of weapons from the legal trade, thus providing effective controls to curtail the spread and use of small arms and light weapons.

Ms. Vatne (Norway): Norway would like to align itself with the views expressed in the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the European Union on draft decision A/C.1/60/L.55, entitled "International instrument to enable States to identify and trace, in a timely and reliable manner, illicit small arms and light weapons".

The Chairman: As no other delegation wishes to take the floor, I will now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of position before action is taken on the draft resolution.

Mr. Loedel (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): The States members of MERCOSUR — Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay — and associated States Bolivia, Chile, Columbia, Ecuador, Peru and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela would like to explain their position before action is taken on the draft decision. The following countries also fully associate themselves with this statement: Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua and Panama.

During the meetings of the Open-ended Working Group to Negotiate an International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons, our subregion expressed its unequivocal preference for a legally binding instrument whose scope would include not only small arms and light weapons, but also ammunition.

MERCOSUR and associated countries take the view that the negotiations to arrive at such an instrument afforded a unique opportunity to send a clear signal with regard to the determination of the United Nations to confront the serious problem posed by the illicit trade in such weapons.

From the start of negotiations, MERCOSUR and associated countries interpreted the United Nations Programme of Action as a road map that recommended certain measures and provisions for adoption at the national, regional and global levels. That instrument, in its section IV, reflects the consensus achieved in 2001 as to the need to keep moving forward with regard to the adoption of instruments to deal with specific subjects that may contribute to the Programme's implementation, including marking, tracing and illicit brokering.

Our countries' view was that we must take advantage of the political momentum offered by the establishment of the first Open-ended Working Group mandated to negotiate a new agreement on the basis of the Programme of Action, while at the same time expressing a strong and clear-cut commitment on the part of the international community to adopting tough instruments against the proliferation of and illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons.

In that context, MERCOSUR and associated countries always had in mind that such a step would set a precedent fundamental to future progress in the framework of the United Nations, not only in the field of the illicit trade of small arms and light weapons but also on their transfer.

In particular, all our countries would have preferred Member States to acknowledge the need to deal with this issue in a comprehensive manner by including an essential component of small arms and light weapons: ammunition.

In that context, MERCOSUR and associated countries, as well as those countries that endorse this statement, have acceded to international instruments such as Inter-American Convention against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials. As its name indicates, that Convention has a broader scope, because it includes the issue of ammunition.

The fact that the recently negotiated instrument does not include a single reference to ammunition creates a worrisome gap that will limit the chances of the Programme of Action on Small Arms becoming an effective tool in the fight against the devastating effects of the illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons.

Furthermore, that situation puts the Programme of Action in direct contradiction with recent international jurisprudence in the field, which usually treats ammunition as an integral part of the problem of

arms. That is the case of the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and, within our region, Inter-American Convention against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials (CIFTA), which all MERCOSUR member and associated countries, as well as those countries that endorse this statement, have signed and ratified.

Our countries will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution, because that abstention conforms to our commitment to seek an effective, timely and legally binding international instrument, as well as with our efforts towards comprehensive and effective implementation of the agreement reached in last June's negotiations on marking and tracing, to which the countries of our region gave their consensus support. MERCOSUR and associated countries recognize that the provisions on how to undertake marking, the maintenance of registries and cooperation in tracing contained in the marking and tracing instrument are compatible with the obligations of our countries as States parties to CIFTA.

In that regard, our countries reaffirm their commitment to pursue the efforts necessary to conclude a legally binding international instrument that, in an effective, timely and reliable manner, deals with the issue of the marking and the tracing of ammunition, small arms and light weapons and their illicit brokering. Our countries call upon all States to join their efforts to achieve that goal. MERCOSUR, its associated States and those countries endorsing this statement call upon all States to fully implement the recommendations contained in the instrument.

To conclude, MERCOSUR, its associated countries and the countries listed at the start of this statement fully commit themselves to work towards implementation of paragraph 38 of the annex to the report of the Open-ended Working Group (A/60/88), with the aim of achieving a legally binding international instrument, in line with the express desire of almost all delegations throughout the work of the Working Group.

Mr. Mine (Japan): We ask for the Chairman's indulgence to allow us to make a general statement.

I would like to make some remarks regarding draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects", which was submitted by Japan, Colombia, South Africa and other sponsor countries.

I have learned that a separate vote has been requested on one part of the draft resolution. On that assumption, I would just like to say that it is deeply regrettable for the international community that a request was made to put a paragraph of this draft resolution to a separate vote. This draft resolution enjoyed consensus adoption in past years. It is Japan's strong belief that it should be adopted by consensus in order to ensure an active and steady implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action at all levels, which demonstrates a reliable approach to resolving problems related to small arms and light weapons.

The Chairman: A point of order has been raised by the representative of Mexico, on whom I call.

Mr. De Alba (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I am very sorry to have to use a point of order — and also to recall for the Committee what a point of order means. The speaker has to be interrupted at the moment that a point of order is raised. And this point of order is being made because the delegation of Japan, as a sponsor of the draft resolution, cannot make an explanation of vote or address the content of the draft resolution. Statements of a general nature have been concluded. We are now in the segment of explanations of vote before the vote.

The Chairman: The point raised by the Mexican delegation is that Japan, as a sponsor, is not entitled to make a general statement. The point is well taken. So, we will move on to the phase of taking action on the draft resolution.

Mr. Mine (Japan): I thought that we were still at the stage of general statements. At least I remember, a few minutes ago, I asked for your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, and you give me permission to revert to the general statement. Therefore, I was making a general statement with the decision and the guidance of the Chairman.

Mr. De Alba (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mr. Chairman, I believe that you were very clear when you stated that there were no more general statements to be made and invited delegations to move on to the stage of explanations of vote. It was at that time that

the representative of Uruguay took the floor and made an explanation of vote before the vote. The delegation of Mexico also requested the floor to make an explanation of vote before the vote. I do not think that there was any doubt that we had concluded the stage of general statements.

It is not the intention of Mexico to prevent any delegation from taking the floor. Mr. Chairman, if you allow the delegation of Japan to speak, after clarifying that it did not have the right to do so, Mexico will not oppose that decision.

The Chairman: The procedure is rather complicated. As delegations know, we have at least four stages. The first is that of general statement and the introduction of draft resolutions. Next are explanations of vote before the vote, voting and explanations of vote after the vote.

From now on, once we have concluded a phase and there is a speaker speaking in the next phase, I will not allow any delegation to speak under the previous phase.

The delegation of Japan has already started its statement. It can finish as a final exception.

Mr. Mine (Japan): With regard to the particular paragraph put to the vote, operative paragraph 2, I would like to remind all delegations that the paragraph calls upon all States to implement an international instrument on marking and tracing.

I am aware that there would be a kind of dissatisfaction among certain countries, especially vis-à-vis the nature of that instrument. However, in that connection, I would like to point out the following two points.

First, negotiations on the draft instrument were concluded by consensus in the working group last June; it was not through a vote. There was no objection against consensus adoption of the draft instrument.

Secondly, regardless of the nature of the instrument, the implementation of its contents is both possible and necessary.

Having said that, I hope that separate voting will never have a negative impact upon the 2006 review conference. I also hope that the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus. The review conference in 2006 will be a significant occasion for the international community with regard to tackling problems related to small arms and light weapons. Japan sincerely hopes that the international community will make every effort to ensure the success of the review conference, as mentioned in this year's draft resolution.

The Chairman: Japan's statement was the last exception to our agreed procedure. From now on there will be no backtracking. We are now in the second phase of our work, namely, explanations of position before the vote.

Mr. De Alba (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Before I explain the position of the delegation of Mexico with regard to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.57, in addition to expressing the support of the delegation of Mexico for the statement made a few moments ago by the representative of Uruguay, allow me very briefly to also place on record the great appreciation of the Government of Mexico for the efforts of Ambassador Thalmann to reach the best possible outcome in a negotiating process that, as has already been pointed out here, was indeed complex and often the subject of the imposition of the will of the minority over that of the majority. We acknowledge his personal qualities and the enormous effort he has made. Notwithstanding the fact that the result was not satisfactory to my country, I wish personally to commend his dedication.

I would like to say that Mexico will abstain in the voting on paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, concerning the illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects, because the paragraph does not make any reference to existing binding regional and international instruments on the marking and tracing of small arms and light weapons. Our country has always promoted the establishment and implementation of legally binding instruments.

As a State party to the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, as well as to the Inter-American Convention against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials, we are obliged to observe the highest standards on the marking and tracing of small arms and light weapons and on firearms. It is for that reason that we must not agree to the drafting of instruments that are not legally binding or agreed on the basis of standards employing least common denominators.

In the context of the process of consultations and negotiations on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, Mexico suggested including an appeal to States in paragraph 2 to implement all — and I emphasize all — relevant instruments, particularly those binding in nature, above and beyond what has been agreed recently. That suggestion reflected a de facto situation, namely, that there are other binding instruments at both the regional and international level that address this issue.

Unfortunately, the amendments proposed in that regard were not acceptable to the co-sponsors. That was despite the fact that the proposals did not seek to wrest any elements from the draft resolution — on the contrary, the intention was to strengthen the text. Worse yet, the reason given for rejecting Mexico's amendment was the impossibility of incorporating it due to the fact that Mexico itself could not guarantee that it would be accepted by every single Member State and that it would not imply reopening negotiations on the draft resolution — an irregular procedure indeed.

Allow me to reiterate that Mexico regrets that the co-sponsors were unable to acknowledge or reflect on the existence of other important instruments on this matter, especially given, in the short term, the preparatory process before us with regard to the 2006 review conference and, in the medium term, the negotiations on other binding instruments that we will have to agree on to address the problems associated with the illicit brokering of weapons, as well as, perhaps, the trade in weapons and, one would hope, the civilian possession of weapons or any other matter that may be proposed by a Member State to the First Committee.

Mexico also regrets that, through this draft resolution, we have not succeeded in making an overall substantive contribution to the preparatory process of the 2006 review conference. We hope that that preparatory process, which will begin in January 2006, will be carried out in a more constructive, inclusive and, of course, more ambitious atmosphere than that which has characterized the negotiating process on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): I should like to make a short comment regarding a point of order.

I heard what the Chairman said, as well as what was said by the representatives of Japan and Mexico. I do hope that, in applying the rules, we can actually be understanding of the fact that we can all sometimes miss the titling of when we are speaking — it is very easy to do; this is not always a terribly clear process we are engaged in. I therefore hope that, while also applying the rules, we can be reasonably humane and understanding towards each other. But we will be your good servants, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: So there will be exceptions to our procedure, from time to time, in a humane way? Let us see.

As there are no further requests for the floor at this stage, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/60/L.55.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/60/L.55, which is entitled "International instrument to enable States to identify and trace, in a timely and reliable manner, illicit small arms and light weapons" was introduced by the representative of Switzerland and the Committee's 11th meeting, held on 13 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.55 and A/C.1/60/INF/2. Albania, Azerbaijan and Denmark have also become sponsors of the draft decision.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg,

Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Draft decision A/C.1/60/L.55 was adopted by 145 votes to none, with 25 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57.

A recorded vote has been requested on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, as well as a separate recorded vote on its operative paragraph 2.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, which is entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects", was introduced by the representative of Japan at the Committee's 11th meeting, on 13 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in documents A/C.1/60/L.57 and A/C.1/60/INF/2. In addition, the following countries have now become sponsors of the draft resolution: Australia, Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, the Dominican Republic, Iraq, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Suriname, Thailand and Turkey.

With the permission of the Chairman, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects".

"Under the terms of operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, the General Assembly would, respectively, decide to establish a group of governmental experts appointed by the Secretary-General on the basis of equitable geographical representation, commencing after the review conference and no later than 2007, to consider further steps to enhance international cooperation in preventing, combating and eradicating illicit brokering in small arms and light weapons, in three sessions of one week's duration each, and to submit the report on the outcome of its study to the General Assembly at its sixty-second session, and request the Secretary-General to provide the group of governmental experts with any assistance and services that may be required for the discharge of its tasks.

"Provisions have been made under section IV (disarmament) of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 that would enable the Department for Disarmament Affairs to provide appropriate services to the three sessions of the group of governmental experts that will be established in accordance with operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007."

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, my delegation wishes to reiterate its strongly held view that all delegations should have adequate notice of draft resolutions that generate oral statements with regard to resource implications, prior to their consideration on the floor. As we have all affirmed previously, our concern for the transparent management and funding of First Committee initiatives is paramount. We respectfully request that the oral statement read out by the Secretary be issued in writing. We also request a postponement of the vote, in order to study the technical aspects of the statement that has just been read out as well as to study the possible financial implications of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The representative of the United States has made two requests. The first is that the oral statement be made available as soon as possible, which we can do. As soon as we receive the oral statement from the appropriate department, we shall make it available to any delegation on request. I take it that satisfies the first request of the representative of the United States.

The second request was to suspend the Committee's action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57. Are there any comments from the floor with regard to that request?

Mr. Mine (Japan): With regard to the point of order raised by the representative of the United States, I would like to ask for clarification about the request to postpone the Committee's taking of a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57. As I understand it, there have been cases in the past — including yesterday — when decisions on draft resolutions were taken after oral statements were made on behalf of the Secretariat indicating that there were no budgetary implications. In fact, I recall a certain draft resolution on which Japan, along with the United States, referred to budgetary implications.

In that connection we received an oral statement from the Secretariat. The procedure was not halted, nor was there a request to do so. An oral statement has been made in the current circumstance, but a request has been made to halt the process. I certainly stand to be corrected, but I do not see any difference between the two cases. I should therefore like clarification in that regard.

The Chairman: There is a distinction. Oral statements were read out in both cases — yesterday concerning the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research and today regarding draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57. The difference is that we did not have a request yesterday to postpone our decision, but today we do. Any request for postponement during the course of taking action will have precedence over the voting action. The point of order raised by the representative of the United States therefore has precedence over our taking action. Therefore, to my mind the difference is very clear. We must take that point of order into consideration.

I call on the representative of Sierra Leone.

Mr. Rowe (Sierra Leone): I feel that the First Committee is treading on the territory of the Fifth Committee on budgetary matters. Having said that, I wish to refer to rule 128 of the rules of procedure:

> "After the Chairman has announced the beginning of voting, no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connection with the actual conduct of the voting."

The Chairman: Everything therefore boils down to the interpretation of the point of order raised by the representative of the United States. I shall reflect on that point.

I call on the representative of Mexico.

Mr. De Alba (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I think that the statement made by the representative of Sierra Leone is prescient. I believe the rules are very clear: the point raised by the representative of the United States was out of order because it did not refer to voting, but to programme budget implications.

I tried to be humane, as invited to do by the representative of the United Kingdom. I therefore chose not to make a motion. But I think that, for the good of the Committee, we must abide by the rules of procedure. As pointed out by the representative of Sierra Leone, the rule is very clear: once the voting process has begun, it can be interrupted only with regard to an issue pertaining to the voting itself.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the United States.

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): First of all, thank you once again, Mr. Chairman, for entertaining our point of order. I just wish to make a

couple of other technical points that may be helpful in clarifying the situation.

First, it is my understanding that the rules of procedure of the General Assembly allow for any delegation to request information about programme budget implications. We are not requesting such information, as we are interested in moving things along as efficiently as possible. My understanding is that there is a requirement that 48 hours must transpire after requests for information about programme budget implications are made by delegations before the Committee can take action. We are asking for something less than that. But we think one thing is very important, namely, the question of oral statements on programme budget implications.

I do not think that such oral statements are mentioned in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. It is therefore difficult to address how they should be handled. I would therefore respectfully suggest that oral statements on programme budget implications be excluded, that, while this is the practice, they are not really appropriate at this time. Rather, we should focus on how we do our business most efficiently and effectively.

I thank the representative of Mexico for the reference to the need to behave in a humane manner towards each other. I agree completely. We certainly could have made our request at the beginning of the Committee's consideration of the cluster. If that is appropriate, we can do that in future instances. But it seems that for most delegations here, mine included, the most logical time to raise the flag to request such an intervention is just immediately after the delivery of an oral statement, because that is when delegations understand what we are asking for and why. If there are some rules of procedure that would overrule that, that is fine; I shall be happy to raise my point at a different time. It seems to me that, for the sake of clarity, and as oral statements on programme budget implications are not mentioned in the rules of procedure, the logical time to talk about them is immediately after they are delivered, and before action is taken.

We are in your hands, Mr. Chairman, with respect to whatever works most efficiently and effectively in this regard. Again, I hope that we can proceed to consider this request in the most expeditious manner possible.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of Cuba.

Mr. Requeijo Gual (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I shall be brief.

My delegation interprets the conduct of the voting in the same manner as the representatives of Mexico and Sierra Leone. I believe the rules of procedure are quite clear in that regard.

The Chairman: I once again call on the representative of Sierra Leone.

Mr. Rowe (Sierra Leone): I may be wrong, but I think the representative of the United States has acquiesced to my citation of rule 128 of the rules of procedure — that we are in the process of voting and that the voting cannot be interrupted, for the reasons stated in the first three lines of rule 128. I do not want to make a motion, but I leave it in the Chairman's capable hands that we should proceed with the voting on this cluster.

The Chairman: I call on Mr. Nobuyasu Abe, Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs.

Mr. Abe (Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs): It is not customary for someone from the Secretariat to intervene when Member States are commenting on procedure. But, as the representative of the United States has said, I think that we need to approach this question from a practical point of view.

When the provisional rules of procedure were adopted, soon after the establishment of the United Nations, there was no provision for the issuance of programme budget implications or oral statements on them. The fact is that Member States must bear the cost of any action by the General Assembly. Providing oral statements to Member States about programme budget implications — for example, that the taking of a given decision may entail millions of dollars in costs to Members — makes it possible for them to determine their positions on votes.

I therefore think that, practically speaking, it is to the benefit of all Member States to consider this question. In essence, either one provides oral statements beforehand in order that Member States can take informed decisions prior to the voting, or they may in practice be obliged to ask for deferral of action

until oral statements are actually made. I think that is the question facing the Committee.

The Chairman: I ask the Committee's indulgence while I consult with a member of the Office of Legal Affairs for a few minutes.

* * *

The Chairman: The point of order raised by the representative of the United States, concerning oral statements, has its merits as regards our consideration. We as a Committee must be transparent, and the Secretariat must make the oral statement available to all members as soon as we receive it from the budgetary authorities. There is no question in that regard.

With regard to the second point raised by the representative of the United States, namely, that we postpone the voting, precedent appears to side with rule 128 of the provisional rules of procedure. I have read the rule several times, and it seems to me crystal clear that, absent a point of order on the voting itself, once the voting procedure has begun it cannot be interrupted.

With all due respect to the arguments raised by the representative of the United States, we shall now resume the voting process.

I call on the representative of the United States.

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): I approached the podium earlier to try to gain a sense of what members thought would be the appropriate time for me to make an intervention to ensure that the points could be made, and that they would not be in contravention of the rules of procedure. Perhaps the legal expert had not been consulted at that point, nor on the reference to rule 128. Acting in good faith, as I did, upon the advice given by those on the podium to make the intervention when I did, I am disappointed to hear the Chairman's ruling, but I understand it.

With due respect to the Chairman, having said that, I will not be able to participate in the voting as a consequence of that decision.

The Chairman: The points made by the representative of the United States are well taken.

I made this decision because I believed it to be correct under the rules of procedure. Moreover, in procedural terms, the oral statement made it clear that the draft resolution has no budgetary implications, so I concluded that we could take action on the draft resolution at this stage. But the points of the representative of the United States are well taken, and from now on, the statement will be made available to all delegations upon receipt from the budgetary department.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to continue the voting procedure.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now continue to vote on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, which reads as follows:

> "Calls upon all States to implement the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa,

San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Jamaica, Mexico

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57 was retained by 162 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The Chairman: I should like to inform members that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution, as a whole, be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, as a whole, was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Ms. García (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela believes that the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons intensifies violent acts and impedes efforts in many countries to resolve conflicts and problems such as common crime, organized crime, drug trafficking and terrorism.

Our country is committed to multilateral efforts to combat those problems. We are implementing and support the measures set out in the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. We are a party to the Inter-American Convention against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials and to the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

Moreover, we support the implementation of the international instrument to enable states to identify and trace, in a timely and reliable manner, illicit small arms and light weapons, despite the fact that we would have preferred that it be legally binding. That is why we did not oppose the consensus regarding draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects".

However, we wish to express our reservations regarding the draft resolution's sixth preambular paragraph, which refers to the outcome document (resolution 60/1) of the 2005 world summit. We wish to recall that, when the outcome document was adopted, Venezuela's Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Ali Rodríguez Araque, expressed my country's reservations concerning all its contents because of the way in which the instrument had been negotiated and adopted. Subsequently, the President of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Mr. Hugo Chávez Frías, denounced the document as null, void and illegal since it had been adopted in violation of United Nations rules and had no validity for our country.

Therefore, the outcome document of the 2005 summit has the value of a mere working paper for our delegation. Its mention generates no responsibilities or obligations for the Republic because of the serious omissions that it reflects.

Ms. Miller (Jamaica): The delegation of Jamaica abstained in the voting on draft decision A/C.1/60/L.55, entitled "International instrument to enable States to identify and trace, in a timely and reliable manner, illicit small arms and light weapons". Our position in that regard is similar to the explanations offered earlier by the representative of Mexico and by the representative of Uruguay, on behalf of the Common Market of the South (MERCOSUR).

During the general debate, Jamaica expressed its strong reservations regarding the recommendation submitted to us by the Open-ended Working Group established to elaborate an international instrument on the marking and tracing of illicit small arms and light weapons. We are profoundly disappointed that the

Working Group did not produce a more substantive instrument that would have been legally binding.

Jamaica is committed to the prevention, combating and total elimination of the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons. We have been pursuing that objective through the implementation of relevant agreements, including the Inter-American Convention against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials. Jamaica is also a party to the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

While the provisions of the instrument just adopted are in keeping with the obligations assumed by Jamaica under it and other instruments, we are concerned that we have been asked to implement provisions that are weaker and less prescriptive, thereby diluting provisions already adopted within the framework of our national laws. By not imposing sufficiently strong obligations on producer countries with regard to marking and tracing, the instrument does not provide for the reinforcement needed to assist in our fight against the illicit trade in small arms. The instrument should also have included ammunition within its scope.

We believe that the non-binding nature of the instrument, and hence its voluntary application, will do little to stem the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons, thereby becoming ineffectual. We recognize that the steps taken to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons involve a collective responsibility on the part of all members of the international community. However, the main burden of that responsibility should fall on those States that produce small arms. A legally binding instrument would have assisted in that regard by strengthening the controls on transfers of such weapons.

Although we will implement the provisions of this instrument, we will continue to pursue the development of an internationally legally binding instrument to deal with the marking and tracing of small arms, light weapons and ammunition and with the illicit brokering of all such weapons.

Ms. Mangray (Guyana): I am taking the floor to offer an explanation of vote after the voting on draft decision A/C.1/60/L.55, on the marking and tracing of small arms and light weapons.

The international community has been faced with the destabilizing effects and security implications of the excessive accumulation and transfer of illicit small arms and light weapons, as my delegation has stated throughout the process that has resulted in a political instrument on marking and tracing.

Although we voted in favour of the decision, we are of the view that a legally binding instrument would have reflected a stronger global commitment, which is needed to curb the illicit traffic in small arms. As is well known, arms trafficking is linked to such activities as drug trafficking and terrorism, which has a direct impact on national security. Guyana and other countries in the Caribbean have been especially vulnerable to the armed violence generated by drug trafficking and other factors, as reflected in the statement made by the representative of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines on behalf of CARICOM. We therefore hope that the international instrument on marking and tracing will help in reducing those vulnerabilities.

My Government remains committed to working with the international community to eradicate the danger to human life and livelihoods represented by small arms and light weapons. In this regard, we certainly hope that any instrument to be negotiated in the future will be legal in nature. We look forward to the meetings next year on small arms and light weapons, and hope that they will enable the international community to move beyond set prescriptions and expedite the process of implementing all agreements relating to this issue.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): I am taking the floor to explain our position on draft resolution A./C.1/60/L.57.

France supports the principle of consensus in the area of small arms and light weapons. Some delegations have expressed the fear that the adoption of a non-binding instrument on the marking and tracing of small arms and light weapons might set a bad precedent for their regions. However, by breaking with the consensus on the Programme of Action and on the issue of small arms for the first time in five years, those countries would be creating a much more dangerous precedent at the global level. We will not resign ourselves to that. We hope that those countries

will be able to return to the path of consensus on this issue. We call upon each of them to work in that direction.

Mr. Kucer (Slovakia): My delegation would like to request a correction to document A/C.1/60/INF/2, in which Slovakia is listed as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57. Slovakia did not sponsor that draft resolution.

The Chairman: The Committee will move on to cluster 5, "Regional disarmament and security".

The Committee will proceed to take action of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.19. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.19 is entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement at the Committee's 14th meeting on 18 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.19.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.19 was adopted by 121 votes to 3, with 44 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now move on to cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security".

I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to make statements or introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. Requeijo Gual (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to make a general statement.

Cuba reaffirms the need to preserve multilateralism in international relations, based on the principles of international law and the Charter. In that context, we reaffirm multilateralism as a basic principle, not just for negotiations in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation, but also for the resolution of any problems that might arise among States parties with regard to the fulfilment of commitments undertaken in the context of agreements in that field. Such consultation and negotiation processes must be carried out by means of internationally appropriate procedures, in the context

of the United Nations or of the mechanisms established by the treaties themselves, so as to preserve the collective security system enshrined in their constitutive charters.

Unfortunately, the hopes for peace, stability and cooperation in the world that the creation of the United Nations inspired are far from being realized. The current situation in the areas of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation clearly reflects the crisis of multilateralism at the global level.

Cuba will continue to support, and to be directly involved in, negotiations in the context of existing major multilateral instruments and international organizations in the area of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation. Those instruments, which rely on verification mechanisms that are non-discriminatory and are designed to foster consultation and cooperation among the parties with a view to resolving disputes, facilitate compliance with obligations and provide disincentives for any resort to unilateral measures that violate the principles of international law and the Charter.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like to introduce a revised draft resolution — A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1 — entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities".

First of all, we are grateful to delegations for their support of the Russian draft resolution. During discussions in the First Committee, proposals were made for some small revisions to operative paragraph 1.

The purpose of that was to avoid potential ambiguities with regard to the fact that confidence-building measures in space could affect the legitimate interests of the users of spacecraft. We did not in any way mean to imply such an effect. However, in order to provide additional clarity vis-à-vis our intentions, we have agreed to the amendments considered desirable by our partners.

It is precisely to those ends that we put forth draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1. The problem of ensuring security and safety in outer space, as well as the security of space objects in general, is becoming increasingly relevant. Efforts to promote transparency and build confidence in outer space can play an important and positive role. The United Nations already has vast and varied experience in this area. We call upon representatives to support our draft resolution.

The Chairman: As no delegation wishes to take the floor in explanation of position before the voting, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/60/L.13.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/60/L.13, which is entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 18 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.13.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/60/L.13 have expressed the wish that the draft decision be adopted by the Committee without a vote. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/60/L.13 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.14.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.14, which is entitled "Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement on Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 18 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.14.

The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.14.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh,

Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Israel, Latvia, Micronesia (Federated States of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.14 was adopted by 116 votes to 6, with 48 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.15.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.15, which is entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 18 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.15.

The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.15.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua,

Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.15 was adopted by 167 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call on representatives wishing to explain their positions after the voting.

Mr. Meyer (Canada): I have taken the floor on behalf of Australia, Canada and New Zealand to explain our abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.14.

We once again wish to express our disappointment that the draft resolution does not take into account concerns that we and others share. We have demonstrated firm and long-standing support for multilateralism across the diplomatic spectrum, and we agree that multilateralism is a core principle in non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament. We also believe it is useful to take advantage of opportunities to reinforce that view in appropriate forums. But although multilateralism is a core principle in our work, it is not, as the draft resolution suggests in its operative paragraphs 1 and 2, the sole core principle.

In our view, that language places other measures — plurilateral, regional, subregional, bilateral and, even, unilateral measures — in a lower tier of importance, even as their complementarity is noted in the eighth preambular paragraph. We consider that all those various measures can contribute to effective global non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament.

As we know from last year, we also have concerns about the way parts of the draft resolution are phrased. We should be describing an inclusive vision of multilateralism by finding language that will appeal to a wider range of parties. The sponsors might find that a more inclusive and comprehensive approach could enjoy wider support within this forum, thereby reinforcing the message they wish to convey.

We hope that there will be an opportunity for substantive discussions, possibly including informal consultations, should this draft resolution be presented again in future years.

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): I have taken the floor to offer an explanation of our delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.15.

The United States previously made clear in the Committee the fact that it sees no direct connection between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control agreements. Frankly, we also remain unconvinced that this draft resolution is relevant to the work of the First Committee.

The United States believes that States parties to bilateral, regional or multilateral arms control and disarmament agreements should take relevant environmental concerns into account when implementing such agreements. The United States Government operates under stringent domestic environmental regulations, including in the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements. Concern for the environment, however, should not lead us to overburden the critical negotiations phase of crafting an agreement. Such agreements are difficult enough to negotiate without having to take into account factors that are not relevant to their central purpose. In addition, it should not be the role of the United Nations to attempt to set standards for the content of arms control and disarmament agreements. It is up to the parties to such agreements to choose the provisions by which they are willing to be bound.

Draft resolutions on this subject have not changed in the course of the past five General Assembly sessions. That suggests to us that draft resolution

A/C.1/60/L.15 and its predecessors have not generated progress towards resolving the issues its sponsors wish to address. For that reason, and because of our continuing reservations about the appropriateness and utility of this draft resolution, the United States voted "no".

The Chairman: The Committee will now move on to the last cluster for today: cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery".

The floor is now open for delegations wishing to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): I do wish to make a statement, but I would first raise a point of information. For the sake of clarification, is it now the ruling of the Chair that this would be the appropriate time for my delegation to request — as we have previously done along similar lines — that any oral statements regarding financial implications of any draft resolution in this cluster be submitted in advance for our consideration? Or is there a better or more appropriate time when I will not be out of order in making such a statement? I note that I would have to guess which draft resolutions to be considered will generate such statements, but I am willing to take that chance.

The Chairman: The voting process has not yet started, so I think the representative of the United States can proceed.

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): I hope you understand, Mr. Chairman, that my remarks are in no way meant to demonstrate any disrespect for you or for the hardworking members of the Secretariat. They are directed only at the situation in which we find ourselves.

Under this cluster — although it has not been officially announced in any way — it is our expectation that draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.18 and A/C.1/60/L.41 may generate oral statements regarding programme budget implications. In that connection, I wish to state again that my delegation wishes to reiterate its strongly held view that all delegations should have adequate notice of draft resolutions that generate oral statements with regard to resource implications, prior to their consideration on the floor.

To reiterate further, as we have all affirmed previously, our concern is for the transparent management and funding of First Committee initiatives. That is paramount. We therefore respectfully request that, should they be offered with regard to draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.18 or A/C.1/60/L.41, oral statements be issued in writing. If that is the case, we also request that there be a postponement of the vote on those two draft resolutions, in order to enable members to study the technical aspects of the statement that would be read, as well as the possible financial implications of those draft resolutions, should they indeed produce oral statements.

The Chairman: The representative of the United States has requested that the Committee defer its action on draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.18 and A/C.1/60/L.41. Are there any objections to that request?

That not being the case, the Committee will defer its action on those two draft resolutions. We shall therefore consider only draft decision A/C.1/60/L.17 at this time.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/60/L.17.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/60/L.17, which is entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 18 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.17.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/60/L.17 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft decision without a vote. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/60/L.17 was adopted.

The Chairman: A number of delegations have asked for the floor, and I shall call on them now.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): I simply wish to make a very short comment, if I may. I fully respect what the Chairman said on the question raised earlier with regard to oral statements on financial issues. But could I, just from the point of view of my delegation,

recall that it does seem to me, as a very practical person from a very practical country, that we are creating a rather daft situation, in which delegations now have to anticipate whether there will be oral statements. They have to anticipate what those oral statements say, but they must express their views in advance of their being presented. It seems to me an extraordinarily daft situation to have created.

I do not mean any disrespect to you, Mr. Chairman, for I know you do not wish to create it, but I do think that the legal advisers and others should perhaps reflect a little upon the sense of creating a situation in which this is going to continue to happen.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the Russian Federation on a point of order.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I too would like briefly to share with the Committee my views on the situation regarding oral statements.

As we are all aware, at the Committee's next meeting we will consider draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.29, which was introduced by the Russian Federation and which is entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security". I know that an oral statement regarding the programme budget implications of that draft resolution has already been prepared.

I should like to ask the Secretariat to take an internal decision to settle this matter, as well as to speak to other interested delegations in order that relevant and timely information can be made available to all States before the consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.29, so that we do not face a situation similar to the one that has arisen in the Committee today.

Mr. Abdelaziz (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of Egypt would like to express its gratitude for the Chairman's sincere dedication to adhere to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, and especially with regard to strictly respecting rule 128. In that connection, the delegation of Egypt would like to take this opportunity to read out the succeeding rule, rule 129 of the rules of procedure:

(*spoke in English*)

> "A representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment should be voted on separately. If objection is made to the request for division, the motion for division shall be voted upon. Permission to speak on the motion for division shall be given only to two speakers in favour and two speakers against" — and the most important part — "If the motion for division is carried, those parts of the proposal or of the amendment which are approved shall then be put to the vote as a whole. If all operative parts of the proposal or of the amendment have been rejected, the proposal or the amendment shall be considered to have been rejected as a whole."

(*spoke in Arabic*)

The delegation of Egypt would like to draw the Chairman's attention to that important rule so that all the rules of procedure may be adhered to strictly in our work in the future.

The Chairman: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform the Committee that informal working paper 4, on our work for tomorrow, will be distributed shortly. I simply wish to make the point that we have only six or eight draft resolutions for consideration tomorrow. The following draft resolutions are now ready for action: A/C.1/60/L.8, A/C.1/60/L.30, A/C.1/60/L.34, A/C.1/60/L.49, A/C.1/60/L.16 and A/C.1/60/L.29 — as well as possibly A/C.1/60/L.18 and A/C.1/60/L.41, on which action was postponed at the request of the representative of the United States.

Unless any delegation has strong feelings about taking action on a given draft resolution tomorrow, I propose that we postpone tomorrow's meeting until the day after, Friday, 28 October, when there will be ample time to deal with other draft resolutions that maybe ready, in addition to the ones scheduled for action tomorrow.

Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to my proposal.

It was so decided.

The Chairman: The Committee's next meeting will therefore take place on Friday, 28 October.

Let me recall that, in addition to the draft resolutions I referred to a moment ago — A/C.1/60/L.8, A/C.1/60/L.30, A/C.1/60/L.34,

A/C.1/60/L.49, A/C.1/60/L.16 and A/C.1/60/L.29, plus A/C.1/60/L.18 and A/C.1/60/L.41 — we must still take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.22, A/C.1/60/L.62, A/C.1/60/L.38, A/C.1/60/L.33, A/C.1/60/L.37, A/C.1/60/L.56, A/C.1/60/L.1, A/C.1/60/L.35 and A/C.1/60/L.39.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): Just for clarification, is what you have just read out, Mr. Chairman, everything we are going to take up on Friday, or everything that is left? I am not being difficult: I just think that otherwise we are going to be slightly confused as to what exactly we are doing on Friday and what we are doing on Monday.

The Chairman: The list I have read out is not exhaustive. There are still outstanding draft resolutions with which we must deal.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): In order to avoid questions on Friday, I should like to inform members that, as I already mentioned today, Russia's draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1 will be ready for action on Friday. The Secretariat has informed us that the revised draft resolution will be issued either this evening or tomorrow morning. Delegations will therefore have sufficient time to review it in accordance with the 24-hour rule. We will therefore be able to act on it at Friday's meeting, as agreed.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.